

ONE PENNY.

International Militancy

BY

CHRISTABEL PANKHURST.



Miss CHRISTABEL PANKHURST.

A SPEECH

DELIVERED AT

CARNEGIE HALL, NEW YORK,

JANUARY 13th, 1915.

THE WOMEN'S SOCIAL AND POLITICAL UNION,
LINCOLN'S INN HOUSE, KINGSWAY. W.C

Important New Pamphlets stating the
Case for the Allies.

THE WAR

BY

CHRISTABEL PANKHURST.

A SPEECH

DELIVERED AT

THE LONDON OPERA HOUSE,

SEPTEMBER 8th, 1914.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

AMERICA and THE WAR

BY

CHRISTABEL PANKHURST.

A SPEECH

DELIVERED AT

CARNEGIE HALL, NEW YORK,

OCTOBER 24th, 1914.

PRICE ONE PENNY,

INTERNATIONAL MILITANCY

BY

CHRISTABEL PANKHURST.

A SPEECH

DELIVERED AT

CARNEGIE HALL, NEW YORK,

JANUARY 13th, 1915.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

International Militancy.

A Speech delivered by

CHRISTABEL PANKHURST

AT THE

Carnegie Hall, New York, on January 13th, 1915.

WE are here to-night to consider the militancy in which some countries are engaged for the sake of ideals which are as precious to America as they are to Europe itself.

It has been very well and truly said that this great war is a conflict of two ideals. The allied nations are fighting for one ideal, and Germany and her two unfortunate friends—I had almost said victims—Austria and Turkey, are fighting for an opposite ideal.

German-Americans.

To illustrate this point I am going to give you something that I found in a most interesting book called "Germany's Claim on German-Americans," written by an American who used to be a United States Consul in Germany. Now this book is really a warning to German-Americans to beware how they conduct themselves if they ever go back to the Fatherland. The writer of the book, Mr. Edward Tingle, says: "The attitude taken as a matter of course by a German-American in America may not be assumed at will by citizens of the United States towards the German Government without the possibility of disagreeable consequences arising. The reason is not far to seek. The German in America learns to breathe the air of complete unrestricted personal liberty. Therefore, when he goes back to Germany, unconsciously or else provoked by the astonishing contrast between American liberty and German lack of liberty, he is likely to find himself drawing comparisons between the way they do things in America and the way they do them in the Fatherland. This criticism is dangerous." Says Mr. Tingle again: "There are many laws in Germany which forbid conduct

and expressions of opinion which are freely permitted in the United States." And I would like to add in Great Britain too. For example, Mr. Tingle warns you, you may not criticise the Kaiser. You are allowed to criticise the President, but if you say the same things about the Kaiser that you could freely say about the President you will find yourself in prison. Anybody who hears you criticising the Kaiser in Germany can go to a prosecuting attorney and tell tales of you. He is then obliged to prosecute you, and you get sent to prison. Prosecutions for the offence of criticising the Kaiser are very common, Mr. Tingle informs us, and penalties in this respect are very frequently imposed. Then there is the further offence of criticising the Government. Why, you in America are always criticising the Government, but you will be sent to prison if you criticise the institutions and the Government of Germany.

Yet another offence against German laws is to "insult an official." Suppose when you are travelling in a railway train you have a dispute with one of the railway officials and in the course of the dispute, even though he is in the wrong and you are in the right, if you use any disrespectful language towards him, you can be put in prison for the offence of insulting an official. Now, you know such laws are hardly tolerable to people who have breathed the free air of the United States, and so the German-American has to be on his guard lest when he goes back to Germany, his American ways get him into prison.

Constitutionalism v. Tyranny.

By way of further proof that German rule is the enemy of freedom let me quote from a speech by the German Chancellor himself, Von Bethmann Hollweg, who has said that Germany committed a wrong in going through Belgium. The Chancellor, in this speech, declares if a vote of censure is passed upon the Government by the German legislature, that means nothing except that there is a difference of opinion on some particular, and perhaps not very important matter, between the Reichstag and the Imperial Chancellor. But, my friends, in my country if the House of Commons passes a vote of censure on the Government, the Government is compelled to resign office! There you have the difference between British constitutional government and German tyrannical government. In Germany Ministers are under the control of the Kaiser, and in Britain Ministers are under the control of the elected representatives of the people.

Touching upon the question of militarism, the German Chancellor says: "I assert, gentlemen, that the passionate aspiration of every Prussian is to protect against all attacks the Prussian army and its leadership by the Prussian King." And he says, again: "*We must prevent that army ever becoming, after the English model, the army of Parliament, or under any other than under the control of the King of Prussia.*" Now, there is militarism in a nutshell. At home, our Army and our Navy are under the control of Parliament. In Germany the Army and the Navy are under the control of the Kaiser, who is free from the control of the people. The Pro-Germans are trying to persuade you

Americans, and of course they are trying in vain, that England has militarism and navalism just as much as Germany. No, we have not. Our system, military and naval, is the same as the American system, and there is a good reason why: Because the people who started the American constitution got their ideas of a constitution from the one they had seen in operation in the British Isles. Now, my friends, we of Britain and you in America have fought and have suffered, and have sacrificed, that the Army and the Navy and the affairs of our country generally shall be under the control of the people and not under the control of an irresponsible monarch.

QUESTION : What is the people ?

The People must Rule.

MISS PANKHURST : What is the people, I am asked. The men and the women of the country. You may answer me again that women have not got the vote in England yet. No, they have not, and certainly the Kaiser would never give it to them. British women are most certainly going to get the vote, and when they have got it their vote will be worth something, because we have a Constitution worthy of the name, and that they have not in Germany! Read British history, read of the Stuarts and the fight we made against them. Read of Magna Charta. Go back as early as you like in British history and you will find always the same care that the King must not rule the country, but the people must rule; that the King's ministers must not be responsible to him, but to the people of the country, acting through their elected representatives. We British women have not yet entered into our inheritance, but that inheritance exists, having been won for us by our forefathers and foremothers. That Mr. Asquith has not handed over our inheritance to us will not blind us to the fact that the Kaiser, if he could, would destroy it altogether. Why, the men in Germany have not got real votes yet. If the men of Germany had followed the example of the British suffragettes and agitated for full political liberty in Germany, that would have been a better policy than attacking the free and freedom-loving nations of Europe.

You ask, some of you, perhaps—and many have asked me since I came here—why the militants have, since the war began, ceased to fight their Government. It seems to me a very simple question to answer. Our Government may be imperfect, but imperfect instruments are often the means to glorious ends. Liberty has at times been achieved by people who were not perfect. Mr. Asquith has done wrong in his life. To-day he is doing right. And we should indeed be cutting off our nose to spite our face if we were to do anything that would weaken our country in the face of a common enemy. Remember this, that it is our country that is being defended in battle, and it is our inheritance of freedom. We are not going to allow a grudge against Mr. Asquith, a domestic quarrel with Cabinet Ministers, to give a foreign enemy any advantage. We know now where anti-suffragism has its home. We know where it has its real

leader. It has its home in Berlin and its leader in the Kaiser. Our Prime Ministers can be changed, but you can never change the House of Hohenzollern. You can change your President, but if you had Kaiserism here—and some of the German-Americans seem to think they would like to exchange the President for the Kaiser—you would have him and his descendants ruling you for ever. Now some of you may think that democracy is out of date, and in the march of time Kaisers have again come into fashion. But we over there in Europe do not think so.

That shall never be.

You would not have thought much of our intelligence, our patriotism, our love of freedom, if we had let militarism, the Kaiser and all his tribe, use us suffragettes in their task of breaking down the world's stronghold of liberty—use us to help to destroy the mother of Parliaments. No, no. That shall never be.

We shall have plenty of time when this war is over to fight our Civil War for votes for women, though we hope that it will not be necessary and that our countrymen will no longer deny us the vote, but will empower us in helping to make our great country even more worthy of the great task that lies before it.

I have given you out of the mouth of the Imperial Chancellor the admission that German militarism and navalism not only exist, but are, so far as the present rulers of Germany are concerned, to be maintained. And what are the excuses given for German militarism and navalism? One excuse is that the German people are incapable of full self government. In Prince Von Buelow's "Imperial Germany" and in Bernhardt's works you will find it very clearly set down that the German people do not know how to govern themselves. I wonder if the German-Americans here assent to that proposition? The German people will never be free so long as they are governed by rulers who despise their political abilities and think they are only fit for cannon fodder. What did Bismarck say years ago when he was fighting against constitutionalism? He said that Germany could not be governed as Great Britain is governed because the German people are a very different people from the British and so could not be trusted with the same liberty. Again I ask, German-Americans, do you agree with that, because if you do not you ought to be grateful to those armies of the Allied Nations which are making liberty possible for the German people.

Prussian Militarism the Cement.

It is said, again, that militarism is necessary because otherwise Germany would fall to pieces; Prussian militarism being the cement which keeps the nation together. Do you not begin to wonder is Germany really a nation at all, if that kind of binding force is required? France does not need militarism to keep her together, nor does she need a Kaiser. France is France however she is ruled. Whether under a Republic or a King, France has always been France.

QUESTION : How about British navalism ?

MISS PANKHURST : Yes, I shall come to British navalism. The cry of British navalism—that is the latest parrot cry of the enemy. (Interruptions from the audience.)

Oh, I like these interruptions. But I will tell you, sir, this : if you were a suffragette, you would have been thrown out—(laughter and applause)—and then, after you had been thrown out, I should have said I didn't believe in your violent methods. (Laughter and applause.) But you men are always so much indulged. You are the privileged sex, the sheltered ones. We have not the heart to treat you as cruelly and as roughly as you treat us. (Applause.)

Well, now, would you not like to see Germany try to be Germany without this cement of militarism ? And I can tell you this, that we are absolutely determined that militarism and Kaiserism shall not extend their power and influence in the world.

QUESTION : How about British navalism ?

The Latest Parrot Cry.

MISS PANKHURST : Very well. Let us come to it. This is the latest parrot cry, as I have said. I have been in America since October, and practically every day that I have been here there has been a new cry from Berlin. Sometimes it is one thing and sometimes another, but British navalism is the latest parrot cry.

Well, America is not likely to listen to that cry considering her naval policy, her manner of controlling her navy, is just the same as ours. Our navy is under the control of the people as yours is, and later in my speech I shall have something to say concerning the importance of the British navy to America, and to every other free country in the world.

There seems to be only one governing authority in the world who fears the British navy, and that is the Kaiser. But, you know, I am afraid we don't worry our heads much about whether he likes our navy or whether he doesn't. We don't attach the same importance to his Imperial Majesty as some other people seem to do. He, as we know, has a high opinion of the Divine mission of himself and his House. He says : " If we have been able to accomplish what has been accomplished, it is due, above all things, to the fact that our House—the Hohenzollerns—possesses a tradition by virtue of which we consider, that we have been appointed by God, to preserve and direct for their own welfare, the people over whom He has given us power." We don't want the power of the Hohenzollerns over us ! Belgium doesn't want it over her ! America doesn't want that power over her ! France doesn't want to be under that power ; England doesn't want that power directed against her across the Channel. Hohenzollern rule may suit the Germans, but it does not suit us.

The Kaiser says he regards himself as the chosen instrument of heaven. We don't agree, and that is what this war is about. He is not the first monarch that the British people have set out to fight. We have fought our own tyrants, and we are ready to fight the tyrants of any other country if they seek to interfere with our liberty.

The war did not begin in August. It has been going on for some time. There has been a movement to Prussianise the world, and this war has come just in time to stop the process. We refuse to be Prussianised either in time of war or in time of peace. Prussian civilisation may be all right for Prussia, but it does not suit Great Britain, and I do not believe America wants it either.

Nationalism the Foundation for Internationalism.

I have been reading in one of the French reviews an account of how, long before the war, the German army had its forerunners over there; there were spies, financiers, and others there, and as we are told their manœuvres were such that "France was in danger of losing her essential virtues." Yet how important it is that each country shall retain its distinctive qualities and its essential virtues! Don't let us see America Germanised, or France Germanised, or Britain Germanised. I do not like this idea of a universal civilisation made in Berlin and imposed by Berlin. I believe that human culture is built up by the several and different contributions of each country. I am not an internationalist with the nationalism left out. For we must have nationalism as a foundation for internationalism. I believe that this war is going to bring about a great reaction in favour of nationalism of the right kind.

Now the question of who is responsible for the war, has been very thoroughly thrashed out in this country, and it would seem that everybody here has made up his or her mind as to who is to blame.

VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE: England.

MISS PANKHURST: What did I say? Did I not say that everybody had made up his or her mind? That lady has done so. As it happens, most of us disagree with her. (Applause.) You have heard of being in the right with two or three, but our friend is in the *wrong* with two or three. She must feel lonely.

The case for the Allies grows continually stronger as more facts become known. Thus, we have heard from Italy that this war did not arise out of the assassinations in 1914, but that Austria and Germany first proposed to have it exactly one year earlier, only Italy strongly disagreed!

And another interesting fact has come to light, which goes to show Germany's preparation for this war. England cannot boast that she was prepared, can she? On the 23rd of July, Austria issued the ultimatum to Servia. On the 22nd of July, just one day before, the Kaiser sanctioned a measure providing that Germans who have become naturalised in other countries do not by the fact of naturalisation lose

their German citizenship. So, you see, all the German-Americans are Germans still. And this, as I have said, came about just one day before the two Kaisers showed their hands and launched in motion the greatest and most tragic war this world has ever seen. It is said that your German-Americans are such good citizens. The Kaiser thinks so too, and he wants to keep them, and he wants to be able to call upon them for military or any other service. He thinks he has a big vote here in this Republic. The Kaiser makes very free with America. He makes your citizens into his citizens by a stroke of his imperial pen.

The Hope of Freedom for Germany.

Bernhardi, you know, says in his book that it is well to have Germans living here, in America, because they make a centre of political influence for Germany's advantage. But we are glad to know that there are thousands of people here of German birth or descent who are American without the German. They are American pure and simple, who came, or whose parents came, to this country because they had had enough of militarism and enough of Kaiserism, and because they wanted to breathe the air of freedom and liberty. And those men and those women—because I have met them and I know—those men and those women are for freedom and for those peoples who are fighting for freedom, and they are hoping that just as France got freedom in 1870 as the outcome of war, so Germany may get freedom and be able to put to shame those who have said that they did not know how to govern themselves.

Treitschke and Britain.

In the war of 1870 we were neutral. Germany wanted us to be neutral in this present war. We were neutral in the war of 1870, but they didn't like it. They condemned us for being neutral, in other words for not helping them. The famous Treitschke said we were decadent, degenerate and cowardly. He said: "Where once was England there now gapes an immense void in the life of nations." Wasn't that tragic! He said again: "We had hoped—as who would not that had any heart for freedom—that this native land of parliamentary life would be preserved from the fate of all commercial nations." They are very glad America is not in the war, are they? But perhaps they think all the same that you are only a "commercial nation." "We had thought," Treitschke continued, "that the great memories of a glorious past, the wisdom of a statesmanlike aristocracy, and the righteousness of a free people, would have raised a solid dam against the invading flood of that Manchester theory which threatens to sweep away all faith in the moral values of life. The descent of the Island Kingdom down that precipitous path that was once the path of Carthage and of Holland, seems already to have begun." He was, you see, afraid we were on the decline as a nation. But his ghost sees now

that we have not, after all, forgotten how to fight! Then he says: "The plans which are now harboured in France can never be accepted by Germany or Europe; for with the German left bank of the Rhine, *Belgium, too, would be irrevocably lost.*" The Germans were then so afraid that Belgium might be lost and get into French hands. They are ready enough now, forty years afterwards, that Belgium shall be lost—shall be stolen by them. Again he said: "Is there not one among the British statesmen who can perceive what a scornful contempt for England was implied in the fact that the descendant of Napoleon even ventured to embark on such a war. Oh, hypocrisy! Oh, cant, cant, cant! To all appearances, the fight will go on to its finish"—listen to this—"without England once brandishing her trident!" She is brandishing it to-day, and then the Germans cry "navalism!" When they wanted us to fight to help them, then they wanted our navy brought into action. One final quotation from the critic of our past neutrality: "When peace does at length ensue, the weight of the wide world's contempt will lie like a mountain on England's shoulders; and a sympathetic European Congress may perchance assemble which will pronounce the Island Kingdom to be neutral like Belgium and Holland, and will enable the mistress of the seas to sell her war-fleet, like a discarded plaything, to the highest bidder." Yes, that is what would have happened if we had not joined in this war. But, my friends, what do you think of it? When we won't join in a war on their side to bolster up their aggression, then we are contemptible, decadent, cowardly, then our navy is wanted. But when we decide that it is our duty to fight for Belgium, to fight for France, to fight for ourselves, to fight for America, to fight for freedom, then we are in the wrong. Well, we prefer to be in the wrong in the eyes of some people.

If we had listened to the Voice of the Tempter.

Yes, all the bitter, contemptuous words I have quoted we should have earned if we had listened to the voice of the tempter, if we had put our neutrality up for sale, and sold it at the sacrifice—leaving Belgium out of the question for the moment—at the sacrifice of France. We should, indeed, have deserved the destruction Germany would have brought upon us when she was ready for her next war. And remember that Germany sent her Socialists to ask the Italian Socialists to clamour for war against the Allies instead of neutrality. But England and Italy, who both know something of duty and freedom, I think are better judges than the rulers of Germany as to what they ought to do.

America is being told by some people that she is the only sane country in a mad world. Here are these other countries fighting, here is Italy wanting to fight it is said, but wise America is keeping her head. Well, Americans, you can see through all that kind of flattery I know. You have had your wars. You have had your Revolutionary war, and, as an American reminded me the other day, that was a war between a German King in England and British people over here. (Laughter

and prolonged applause.) And then you had your Civil war. Now, do you want to undo those two wars? Do you repent of them?

There is no American here prepared to wear the white sheet of penitence on account of those two wars. Well, then you had the Spanish-American war. You know you could have prevented it. Why did you go to war then? You have no more right to blame us than we had to blame you, and indeed much less, because this is a far more serious thing than your war was. Why, when I first came here, one or two people said—"We have kept out of war with Mexico; why couldn't you keep out of war with Germany?" Now, really, don't you see a little bit of difference between those two things? It may be easy enough to leave a little country like Mexico alone, but it is a rather more difficult question when Germany won't let you alone. When the Kaiser comes knocking at the door with his mailed fist, what are you to do? Open the door, and say, come in, stay in, we will leave you in possession! No, my friends, you could hardly expect that. You would not do it yourselves, though I know there are some few people who say that if the Kaiser called here with about 150,000 troops as a first instalment and more to follow, you would say to him, "Come in, you are welcome here, don't go away, please." But, you here do not think that is practical politics.

VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE: We won't ask England for any help, anyway. Don't worry about that.

What the British Lioness would do.

MISS PANKHURST: Our friend says they won't ask England for help, they will take care of themselves. Well, I hope you will be able to. Because I tell you this: I for one should not feel happy if I knew German troops were here and American women were being treated as the Belgian women have been treated. I don't know what the British lion would do, but the British lioness would feel like ordering out the army and the navy to help to turn the Kaiser out of your fair land, and all his troops with him.

Let us open up the whole subject. Now, you know perfectly well that it is all very well for some people here in America to talk of non-resistance, especially when the Allied Armies as well as the British navy stand between you and the Germans. But if you were over there, you would have done exactly what we have done. Britain has not done one single thing that America would not have done if she had stood in the same place. And I hope you may never fight a less righteous war than we are fighting now. I hope you may never be more in the wrong than England is to-day.

Now, there is this question of British navalism. Well, if we have navalism, so has America. Doesn't the Kaiser say the trident must pass into his hands, and that Germany's future is on the sea? He wants navalism—in other words a navy under

his control as an irresponsible monarch, and used for aggressive purposes. Our navy is under democratic control. And, what is more, none of us here would give much for the Monroe Doctrine unless the British navy were there to stand and fight with the American Navy to protect the free, self-governing peoples of South America from the Kaiser's conquest and domination. Americans often tell me—and it is good hearing for me—about that little incident in Manila Bay. Admiral Dewey knew what we would have done there, and you American citizens here to-day know what we will always do, if you should need our help.

Mere possession of a Navy not Navalism.

Dissentients here to-night talk about "British navalism," yet it has already been explained by the most intelligent people in America that the mere possession of a navy is not navalism, and the mere possession of an army is not militarism. It is when the army and the navy dominate instead of being dominated by the civil power of a country that you have militarism and navalism. And I can tell you this: That if our country in fighting this war had not been very much in the right we couldn't have waged this war at all, because there would have been so much criticism and friction at home that our defence would have been absolutely paralysed, and you know it. And no doubt it is true to say that if your Government here were to wage an unjust war, you would have so much criticism and division of opinion, that that war would have to be stopped. It is so with us and it is so with you. But it is not so where you have the control of the armed forces of the country under irresponsible monarchic control.

Now, what is the good of juggling with words when we have plain facts to guide us. I think that the official German press bureau underrates the intelligence of America, as it has done all along, when it tries to persuade you that we have navalism in the sense that Germany has navalism. Besides, everybody on this earth knows that the great grievance that the Kaiser has against our navy is that it is bigger than his own.

Then there is this other question of interference with American trade. Well, I am sorry to say that war is a very difficult and terrible thing, which interferes with everybody and everything in the world, and for that interference you must blame the Kaiser, because he is responsible. But I am happy, and I am relieved, and I am thankful to see from the speech of President Wilson that all that is wrong with American business is "a state of mind." So you see that the war has not done you such very great harm after all, and I am thankful it is so, because I should not like you, a neutral country, to be suffering in the way that that other neutral country is suffering—I mean Belgium. Remember freedom demands a price, and you Americans who believe that freedom is at stake in this war, who believe that the Allies are fighting for freedom, you, I know, are prepared to accept your share of the sacrificing, and it is a very small share indeed compared to the share of England, compared to the share of France.

Above all, it is small compared to the sacrifice that Belgium is making. After all, what right have you here in America to any kinder fate than that of Belgium? You are both neutral countries and your deserts are therefore equal. Belgium, if she has deserved no better than you have, has deserved no worse. Has Belgium committed any crime that you have not committed? Certainly not.

America Holds Belgium Guiltless.

The whole world, and especially America, holds that Belgium is guiltless, yet, while you Americans are eating good meals here, while you are so placed that your President can publicly say that there is nothing wrong with your business but a "state of mind," Belgium is starving; you are having to feed her. Then, how fortunate America is that she is not suffering as Belgium is suffering. Belgium is neutral just as you are neutral; and Belgium did not seek any quarrel. I am very glad that England has not treated you in the way that Germany has treated Belgium.

VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE: How about Luxemburg?

MISS PANKHURST: Do you not know that the Luxemburg Sovereign has expressed her sympathy with Belgium, and I am sure that the people of Luxemburg are not proud of their immunity. I am sure they are more indignant than any of us at the way in which Belgium has been treated, and I believe they envy the glory that Belgium has won, and how do you know that they would not have shared that glory had they been just a little stronger in the military sense than they are? But if it is a miracle, an absolute miracle, that Belgium was able to make a defence against the German invader, it is not difficult to believe that for Luxemburg to make a defence at all was, humanly speaking, impossible. What right has Germany first to ask any neutral country to forfeit its honour, and then if it refuses to forfeit its honour and to make war on friendly neighbours, to accuse that country of committing a crime. When Americans feel a little worried at the price this war is costing them, they will think of Belgium and realise their comparative good fortune.

VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE: What about the Boer War?

MISS PANKHURST: Yes. The Boers are thinking about that too. They think more about it than you do. And, having thought about the war situation, having weighed up the relative advantages of the German and the British flag, they have decided to fight for all they are worth to stay under the British flag. They see that the love for them expressed in the Kaiser's historic telegram, was the sort of love he feels for Belgium to-day! And the Boers have come to the conclusion that to be a free and self-governing part of a great federation such as the British Empire, is a better fortune than to be a German colony.

I think if you have any sympathy to spare you might pour out a little of it upon Poland or on some of the other places where the Germans have not yet contrived to make themselves as popular as they might.

America a Country of Ideals.

Now, a little more about this trade business. The Germans are possessed by the idea that you are primarily a dollar-hunting nation. They invariably look out for the weak spot in every country and try to get an advantage there. They think your weak spot is the dollar. I don't. I think you are a people of ideals, who love freedom. Your history proves that. I believe you are as ready as Belgium to sacrifice, if need be, even the dollar, important as that is to all countries.

In your Civil War you punished us and our trade pretty hard. You blockaded the southern ports of this country and you would not let us trade freely with the Southern States. I can tell you this: That you pretty well starved to death the working people in the part of the country from which I come. I was born and partly brought up in Lancashire, and I have heard all my life of the brave factory operatives who were deprived of their livelihood because they could not get the raw cotton they needed. But so determined were they to do nothing to uphold slavery that they would not make a murmur, and they would not let our Government interfere. In Lancashire to-day you can see in the faces and in the physique of some of the people the traces of the cotton famine; you can read a message of suffering from the past generation. Why, what those poor working men and women were prepared to suffer I believe you would suffer for the sake of liberty. They would not bolster up slavery and were determined it should be broken down even at the price of their own starvation and death and that of their children. Let no one tell me to-day, in the year 1914, that America is not prepared to pay the price for Belgium and for the freedom of the world—because I know you are.

You will not, I know, protest against our taking advantage of the provisions of international law fairly and freely, you will hardly care to claim your own uttermost right under that law, when you remember what we have to face, and what we are sheltering you from, and what we are doing to save those small countries in Europe who are fighting for their existence. The British Navy to-day is the guarantee of the freedom of the world. (Prolonged applause and loud cheers.)

Not only are you ready to put up with a little loss of business and interference with your trade, but I believe the men of America are prepared to lay down their life in this war if it comes to that. I believe that rather than see Britain and what she stands for defeated, rather than see Belgium wiped off the map, I believe and I know you will enter into this war. You are only out of it because you think you can afford to stay out of it, you are out of it only because you know the victory of the Allies is a certainty.

You are not—I know I express your feeling—you are *not* indifferent as to which side wins in this war. It *is* something to you whether German Kaiserism wins or French Republicanism wins. It matters everything to you whether the Republican ideal is destroyed or whether it is upheld. It means everything to you whether British which stands for constitutionalism wins or whether constitutional

Kaiserism wins. Why, what is life worth to you, unless freedom continues to live?

VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE : How about the Russians?

America to Stand or Fall with France.

MISS PANKHURST : I may have something to say about Russia that a German may not like to hear, but it is something that is true and you cannot deny it. I know that America, rather than see France destroyed, will rush forward to pay that old debt that she owes to France. Your existence as a free and independent nation was won for you because the French were here to help you. That Statue of Liberty in your harbour was reared for you by France. So you are not going to see France go down for any Kaiser in the world. You are going to stand—you are going to stand or fall with France. and it is only because France is able to stand while you are neutral that you are prepared to remain neutral one minute longer. That is the truth, and you may be proud of it.

Certainly America is not even going to be influenced by that nonsense-making individual Bernard Shaw. The men and women of America think straight and are not to be put off the track by any amount of paradoxes.

Now, the matter with Bernard Shaw is that he has been haunted by a jealousy all his life. He is jealous of Shakespeare. I notice that the Germans have adopted Shakespeare as their very own. What do they call him? Our own Shakespeare, our greatest German poet and playwright. Another interesting case of dual nationality! Now, that is more than Bernard Shaw can stand. He must be a German playwright too, and how, in view of this war, can he expect the Germans to place him side by side with Shakespeare unless he says something they like to hear? And so Bernard Shaw, who has been trying to catch up to Shakespeare all his life, trumps up some bad excuses for the Kaiser. But at the end of all his uncommon nonsense about the war, Bernard Shaw has to admit that Great Britain is the policeman of the Western world, and is chaining up the mad Prussian dog. There are times when one thinks the gun is mightier than the pen!

Yes, America stands on the side of freedom as she always has stood. America has made up her mind what the side of freedom is, and those in this country who believe that the Kaiser is right are a small and dwindling band.

Common Sense will forbid Mutual Suicide.

It is absolutely impossible for the Germans to work up a jealousy between Great Britain and America. They are trying to do that. They say, that they love Belgium and love France. Those countries might say "it was all very well to dissemble your love, but you need not have kicked us downstairs, Mr. Kaiser." The Germans assure you that their real enemy is Britain, and they think that in America they can

excite jealousy of us, and can use this to weaken us. They make a mistake. There is one thing German militarists do not understand, and that is human psychology. America and Britain are hand in hand. They may have their little differences of opinion, but they are one and indivisible as soon as a mischief-maker comes along. No Kaiser in the world will be able to drive in a wedge between Britain and America. It can't be done. The boundary line between Canada and the United States, unfortified, unguarded, is the summing up and the symbol of the relationship between our two countries. We both have armies and we both have navies, because it is well for the world that we shall have them, but we are never going to point our guns against each other. Common sense and the love that exists between our two countries forbids such mutual suicide. We are not going to fight, and we are not going to be jealous of one another, because we have a common task to fulfil. Neither of us can do without the other and we are not going to try--therefore let nobody think he is going to find a flaw in our friendship and work it loose, because it is impossible.

Peace Talk.

Now, let us consider the peace talk. Peace is certainly a glorious thing. But it must be at the right price, on the right basis, and it must be a permanent peace. I have noticed this: when people try to beat you by physical force and do not succeed, they take to intrigue. We must be on our guard when we hear peace talk. Perhaps if we had in the past taken more notice of war talk, it might have been wiser. And I do think we are entitled to criticise Mr. Asquith for this: that two years ago the Germans told him they wanted to dominate all Europe, to impose their culture, with a capital "K," upon France, upon Belgium, and the rest. Now, Mr. Asquith never told us of this. So we were going quietly along, not realising the danger before us, when suddenly war came.

Now, why did Mr. Asquith keep that secret? Doubtless because he thought if he told the truth the country would clamour to be fully prepared against war, and that might bring it on. He seems to have had the idea that by smiling at the tiger he could soften his heart. Now that never succeeds. A tiger is a tiger, and if you want to be safe you have got to change his whole outlook on life, and smiling at him won't do it. Once bitten, twice shy. We are not going to live in a fool's paradise any more. We are going to know where we are this time. It would be treachery to the men and women who, victims of the war, have died since war broke out, if those who are left, to escape the dangers they faced, were to patch up a sham peace which would afterwards be broken. If that were done we should have a second war, which would be even worse than the first. We will not think about peace until we have fought our way to a basis upon which peace can be made, and we will not talk of peace, because if we talk of peace the militarists will think we have had enough, and that they need not accept the destiny which the armies of freedom have planned for them.

Who are the people who are talking about peace? I notice that one man who is agitating for peace here, is a man who wants Germany to be moderately victorious. What does Germany being moderately victorious mean? It means Germany taking some of the freedom of the world and turning it into tyranny. It means, among other things, Germany taking Belgium, taking part of France, and taking Holland into the bargain. It means Germany staying where her armies now are. No! we say, "back to where you came from!" Yet this very same man who wants Germany to be "moderately victorious" expects you and me to think him an impartial lover of peace for its own sake. What has he also done? He has broken his friendship with Japan. Remember his money helped Japan to win one war—he wanted peace so much then! He has now broken with Japan, and has resigned from the Japan Society in this country because Japan is not ready to make war against Russia, but is now friendly with Russia. What a peace-loving man this is! Neither Mr. Jacob Schiff nor anybody else is going to secure peace except at the right price, and on the right terms. (Applause.)

A Warning to the Women.

I want especially to warn the women here against being exploited by Germany and the agents of Germany in the sacred name of peace. Be on your guard, women, less you be used by the very people who are the worst enemies of women's freedom and the worst enemies of men's freedom for their purposes of conquest. They think they know very well how to appeal to your noblest sentiments, but guard those sentiments from violation and exploitation. Stand for the right, and have the courage as women to pay the terrible price that has always had to be paid for freedom in this world, and always will have to be paid so long as tyrants walk abroad.

These unblest peacemakers say that everybody is wrong in this war. "They are all claiming to be right, so they must all be wrong." I don't see that. Supposing somebody picks your pocket, or gives you a black eye, and he is hauled before a judge. That man will plead not guilty. But does that prove that he is innocent, or that you and he are both guilty? Certainly not. Of course the Kaiser pleads not guilty in this war. He once hoped to make you agree with him; but that is impossible. Don't listen to all this talk about both sides being in the wrong. If you do you certainly won't help toward the establishment of peace.

Then it is said that neither side can win in this war, and that it is going to be a draw. When I first came here, one or two "peace" people said, "I am sorry to say it, but I believe the Germans are going to win." I said "No, they are not." Now the same sort of people say that nobody can win. They are still wrong. The right side is going to win. It has the resources and the idealism on its side. And what is more, it has the conscience of the neutral world on its side, and it is going to win.

Then, these people say this is nothing but a commercial war. Perhaps it is so far as Germany is concerned. But even for

Germany it is more than that. Because, goodness knows, Germans have been making money freely enough in England. They have come there, and it has been a happy hunting ground for them, and I think the same applies to the United States.

VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE : For English capitalism.

MISS PANKHURST : The question of capitalism is one with which the democracy of the various countries must deal, and I don't suppose you will find a democratic country behindhand in the task of dealing with it.

An American writer informs us that all over the British Empire Germans are making money. And he says : " Let an Englishman try to do business in Germany, or in a German Colony, and he will repent it. Germans in a British country have the same rights as an Englishman or an American," and so on. Very well, then, if that is so, and when you remember that we are a Free Trade nation at home—I think our hands are cleaner than some other peoples, of the stain of commercialism.

Russian Bureaucracy made in Prussia.

Now we come to Russia. You may say that Russia is worse than Germany. If they are both worse one than the other, we are not going to be bullied by either of them. That is the best way. If Russia is a tyrannical country, that is no reason why we should put up with German tyranny. But we find that Prussia is the strongest prop of Russian bureaucracy. Russian bureaucracy is indeed an article made in Germany.

When the Czar wants to give more freedom to Poland, Germany says no. When the Czar thinks of making concessions to the Russian reformers, Germany objects. Russian bureaucrats are frequently Prussians. And the war Russia is making is not only a war for the emancipation of the Balkans; it is a war for the emancipation of Russia from the Prussian influence, which has brought out all the worst in Russian life and has repressed all the best in Russian life.

The Russian people know how to fight for freedom, and the Germans don't. I, as a Suffragette, feel a great admiration for those who have waged an unceasing war for increased liberty, and are steadily and surely gaining their way. Why, the Russian reformers tell us that the one thing that is needed more than anything else to enable them to achieve their purposes, is to get rid of the Prussian support of the evils against which they are fighting. They know who has been their worst enemy. Reaction and injustice in Russia have been bolstered up from the outside, and there is a good reason why. If Russia gives her people liberty, Prussian tyranny will stand alone. The Russian reformer says : " Let us be rid of the Prussian influence." Knowing their passion for freedom, we may trust them to work out their own salvation. But I don't see the German people finding salvation unless the armies of the other countries come and help them do it. What sign do the German people show of claiming those common rights of repre-

sentative government which are known and enjoyed in America, in Great Britain, and in France, and in Belgium to-day? We know where our sympathies are. The Russians, who are forging their way through to liberty, want Prussia turned out of their country, bag and baggage, and they think the war is going to accomplish that. So it is a war of emancipation for them. Even if they are disappointed in their own power to bring freedom in their own country, and even if Russia, as some profess to believe, becomes a danger, we shall be just as ready to meet that danger as to meet the danger the Kaiser is to our liberties to-day.

Not the Voice of True Humanity.

Then there are the people who say: "The horror of this war is too great. We cannot endure it. It must stop. Never mind the consequences. Make this war stop." That is not the voice of true humanity. It is not the voice of liberty. It is the voice of the tyrant, using the suffering he himself creates as a reason why those people who are sacrificing their lives for freedom should be cheated of their reward. We must be true to the dead and continue the fight till peace with honour is achieved. That is what all the people at home believe. One or two Americans have said to me: "I don't see how your women at home can bear to see their husbands and their sons go out to die." What those women say to husband and to son, is this: "I could not love thee, dear, so much, loved I not honour more." And what wife or mother does not better love a dead hero than a living shirker?

The "peace" advocates come down sometimes to lower ground. They say Germany wants more seaports for her commerce. Suppose Switzerland began to whine for seaports. She hasn't *any*! Germany has her own and other countries' seaports for her commerce. But Herr Ballin let the cat out of the bag when he said that Germany wants another naval base in the North Sea. They want a naval base for their fleet, so that they can more effectively strike at other countries. Now, peace lovers, what do you say to that? Do you want to help Germany to get naval bases, and thus to make more devastating war? That seems to be where your policy is tending.

Geography does not fall in with the Kaiser's ambition. But there it is; and land and sea cannot be changed now. If you are an island, which has its disadvantages, instead of a continental country, which has its advantages, you must put up with the consequences.

The British Colonies.

We then come to the question of colonies. If Americans think Germany has a grievance, if it is a question of pacifying them, they are as much responsible for German discontent about colonies as we are. Looking at the map of the British Empire, it is hard to see what

part of it we have got the right to sacrifice and hand over to the Germans in order to make peace until they have digested our concession, and then are ready for more. What right have we got to give up to Germany people now living under our flag?

To sum up the peace propositions that are being made, we find they involve throwing Belgium and Holland and part of France to the German lions, and we are not going to do it. We have made up our minds that Holland and Belgium and the menaced French provinces are to be saved. We have made up our minds there is to be freedom in the Balkans, and freedom wherever we can establish it.

VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE : Freedom !

MISS PANKHURST : Freedom ! exclaims this lady. She is so sad because I have not got the vote. Never mind, I will see to that. You understand what it is, ladies and gentlemen. I have been fighting and all the Suffragettes have been fighting against the British Government for the vote, and this lady and some others are so afraid Mr. Asquith is going to dish us when the war ends. Don't you be afraid of that. We are going to see this thing through. We have not fought with militant methods for so many years, and gone so far, to give up the fight now. No peace at any price for the Suffragettes. But if there are any Englishmen here, do they not see how much stronger our country's moral case would have been in this war if we had been able to say "Great Britain has given votes to women?" Now, that shows how much better it would be. Well, we will get the vote. But I want to remind the Americans that they have not, as a nation, given votes to women. You are giving more votes to the Philippine men, and yet you don't give votes to American women. You gave negro men the vote by a Federal amendment, but you condemn the women of America to go around to every man Jack of you and say : "Please may I have a vote?" While my countrymen are striving and dying for freedom over there, I think you might give freedom to American women. So that, side by side with the glorious achievement which will be recorded to the honour of British men in the book of history there will be something to record as done by American men in the cause of freedom.

Ireland is having her Freedom, too.

Somebody has asked about Ireland. Ireland is having her freedom, too. Already Irishmen have parliamentary votes, and they hold the balance of power in the present British House of Commons. I wish I had as much power as the Irishman has. I freely and fully make the admission that England has wronged Ireland in the past, but it is a very long passed past. It was done at a time before English democracy had so much say in the governing of the country, and the wrongs which England did to Ireland in days less democratic than these are a sign that the unconstitutional Government of Germany is a danger to the world.

The peace at any price propositions are attempts to propitiate the god of war, and are not really peace proposals at all. If you propitiate the god of war you are rewarding and encouraging war. And if the German militarists win an inch of territory in this war, they will say: "We have not fought in vain. We could 'spare' the men who are dead. Now let us rear up more to fight the next war, when we shall add new gains to those we have just secured." Yes, Prussia may hope eventually to swallow the earth if she wins in this war. And that is why we are prepared to go on until not one of us is alive, rather than have such a disgrace and disaster come upon the world.

Peace through Confidence and Friendship.

It is being suggested that we shall go into a federation of nations at the close of this war. It is said, "We in America are a federation. You in Europe must be the same." The answer to that is that the peace of the world will not come from new machinery. It will come from confidence and friendship, and until we feel confidence in Germany, we are certainly not going to be federated with her. You cannot tie us up in a bag and say: "Now, be quiet you bothering Europeans; you have worried us enough." We, in Europe, are going to be careful what we do when this war is over, and we know what we have to guard against. Suffragettes do not want to federate with the Kaiser. We do not want to be unified and federated out of our nationalism, which I think is one of the most sacred and beautiful things that humanity knows. Nationalism is the bridge between the individual and humanity, and you cannot do without that bridge. If you were to try to federate into a huge European State, you would be hard put to it to avoid either anarchy or tyranny. We are not going to try any fantastic plan. One guarantee of peace and the best guarantee is to have democracy in every country. A democratic constitution within the State, a non-aggressive foreign policy, and confidence between nations—those are the means to world peace. We shall not let this war so affect our mental state that we tie ourselves up in some hard and fast confederative tyranny. The only federation we want at the present time, which one may term a federation of the spirit, is a friendship between free and independent nations. But as to having an international governing Committee, sitting at Berlin, I suppose with the Kaiser in the chair, one feels highly suspicious of any such scheme, and we Suffragettes are going to keep both our eyes and ears open when such things are discussed.

American Nationalism.

Nowadays there are people who say they hold nationalism cheap. Yet what do we find in America? Always the national idea insisted upon. You get emigrants from other countries, and you at once begin to turn them into American citizens. You salute the American flag and you talk about American interests. Then are you surprised that we British prize our nationality too? Great Britain stands for some-

thing in the world, has stood for something in the world in the past, will stand for something in the future. We are going to retain our peculiar and not altogether unuseful quality of Britishers. We do not want to be Europeans unless we are first British, and when we consider what our contribution to world culture and world freedom has been, we are not ashamed of it. We have made our mistakes, but on the whole we have not done so badly, and I as an individual feel I am no good to the world unless first I am some good to my country, and I believe you all feel the same. Beware of the people who tell you they want to wipe out racial and national distinctions. I believe that some of those who talk so glibly about internationalism and cosmopolitanism do it because they want to shirk the common tasks of patriotism, to shirk their duty to their country. We know our enemies have traded on the supposed weakening of patriotism in our own land, but they have discovered by now that our devotion to country and freedom are as great as in the old days. If America is put under the same strain, the same will be true. And as for the talk of peace, remember that if you love peace too much, peace becomes ignoble and hideous. There are greater things even than peace, and these are honour and liberty.

When Cardinal Mercier of Belgium says that the religion of Christ exalts patriotism into a law, and that there is no perfect Christian who is not a patriot, we must agree with him. Do you not feel the day is more glorious to you on which you hear of a new victory by the patriots of Serbia or Belgium? Do you not feel then that "God's in His heaven, all's right with the world!" Belgium and Serbia, those Davids among the nations, have held up before the eyes of the big and materially prosperous countries the standard of a great and spiritualised patriotism. They have taught the world to sing again those words you sang years ago in the Battle Hymn of the Republic—"As Christ died to make men holy, let us die to make men free." There are no words even in the vocabulary of peace that are greater than those.

SOME QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

Question: In the event of hostilities breaking out between this country and Japan, what would Great Britain's attitude be if she were called upon to come to the assistance of her Allies? Would she come, or would she consider that treaty a scrap of paper?

Miss Pankhurst: Our friend asks a question that is apparently very much in the minds of some Americans. He speaks of our alliance with Japan, and asks how it would affect our relations with the United States. Now, first, I should like to say that the particular matter which is at the bottom of the question also affects the British Empire at a certain geographical point. It seems to me that one of the things to be done after the war is over, is for England and America to understand one another and to understand Japan, in order

that we may prevent any friction in the future. I think the point raised is very important; but why should it not be possible, by good management and good judgment and fairplay, for those three countries to understand one another? If you think Japan and America can never live quietly side by side without having a war, well, what are your peace theories worth?

Question: Is it honest to talk of English freedom when Ireland is divided about the war? Is it honest to talk of English freedom when you hold 300,000,000 Hindoos under your despotism? Is it honest to talk of English freedom when you have not given the manhood suffrage you are talking about in your own country? Is it honest to talk about English freedom when not one Englishman in two has got the right to vote that you talk about? Is it honest to talk of Germans being driven out of Germany when 300,000 English are driven by poverty out of England every year?

Miss Pankhurst: Now, let me take those various questions. The Irish, with the exception of a few, of the stamp of Sir Roger Casement, who seem to think they would like the Kaiser to rule Ireland—the vast and overwhelming majority of the Irish people are united with the rest of us in this war. The people of India are standing by us in this war. Your great Admiral Mahan expressed his admiration of the way in which Great Britain goes to work as a colonising power. I don't say it is perfection. How could it be when the men are doing it all by themselves? We women very much want to have a hand in governing India, because we think we could suggest many, many improvements. The woman understands certain human problems better than the man. India is marching towards her freedom. She might have been in worse case if Great Britain had not come in to put certain things a bit to rights. When we get the vote we can help to make things far better. I am sure Britain is handling the situation in India very much as America would handle it, and there is a good reason why—because our point of view in everything is so much alike.

Then you ask what about the poverty of England. There is poverty in this country too. And I will tell you who is to blame. It is the men electors themselves, and that is why the women want to vote—to improve things. I do not pretend that the British government is perfect, because British men are not perfect. That is the reason why. But better, better let us work out our own salvation as men and women, than have a despot doing it for us, who may be kind to-day because he wants us to be efficient soldiers, and to-morrow is throwing us into destruction for purposes of his own. We believe at home in democracy. Democracy makes its mistakes, but it is ever marching toward the goal of perfection, and when the democracy is of women as well of men, you will see much better results.

Then you ask about manhood suffrage. Why don't we have it? Because the men there don't greatly want it. Every man is entitled to a vote now if he happens to qualify by living in a house, however cheap, for a certain length of time. There are some restrictions on

the franchise, but not class restrictions. They are simply restrictions of machinery, and the vote can be enjoyed by any man who takes a little trouble to get it.

A Voice from the Audience: Plural voting?

Miss Pankhurst: And plural voting is being done away with, and even if it were not, it is a very small factor in our electoral situation, and the working man has by far the greatest voting power in the country. Our friend does not know quite so much about British conditions as I do, as he is not a British subject.

A Gentleman in the Audience (a Scotchman): As a British subject, might I inform the audience that the women in Glasgow have the municipal franchise, and the American people point to Glasgow as the best governed city in the whole world. And also might I say there are more Germans working in Great Britain than British in Germany. May I also say that in 1905 Russia had its revolutionary era; when the people were about to succeed, the Kaiser of Germany then offered to the Czar the best troops at his disposal to suppress the revolution in Russia. I want to tell my German friend that not a voice has been raised in Germany against that action on the part of Kaiser Wilhelm the Second.

Question: Have the British people, the British Government, or the Ambassador in Washington, invited Miss Pankhurst to voice British national sentiment in America?

Miss Pankhurst: No, they have not, but I am not in the habit of waiting for instructions from the Government or anybody else. I came to the conclusion it was my duty to come here and speak, and I came.

Question: How about the sacred feelings of nationalism in India?

Miss Pankhurst: We respect those feelings. We want the Indians to be Indians. And I think the greatest safety for their nationality as the world is to-day—and they think so too—is to have the protection of the British flag. The same applies to Canada. But what did the Prime Minister of Ontario, when he spoke in New York, say yesterday? They do not want to part company with us. They want to remain the Canadian part of the Empire.

Question: Did the Russian Government declare war to break the Prussian opposition to Russian revolutionism?

Miss Pankhurst: The Russian revolutionaries say no.

Question (By a woman in the audience): Before you come to the end of the questions, I want to ask one which I consider very important in the interest of peace. Do you think it is just and fair to insinuate that the whole peace movement in America and the rest of the world is

governed by military methods and prejudiced by military aims, as you certainly charged? And do you think it is wise, in a friendly neutral country which is the greatest example of federal government in the world, to call federation tyranny?

Miss Pankhurst : I will answer the second question first. There is nothing so dangerous as a false analogy. Europe and America are different. Here you are developing an American race. Already the American type is manifesting itself. You can be federated as much as you like. And in Great Britain, too, we may, possibly, have our local parliaments, under one central and supreme Parliament. But that is totally different from federating independent Sovereign powers, some of which, it may be, are governed by irresponsible Kaisers and some of which are governed by a democracy. Europe has totally different traditions, totally different circumstances from America, and it would be dangerous to argue from America to Europe or from Europe to America. I admire what you have in America. I think you have chosen the best system for this country. But you cannot impose that system on Europe, because, inasmuch as you attempt to apply it to Europe it will be a different system. You Americans appreciate the conditions that exist in Europe, and I am for maintaining that which you find so refreshing and so beautiful. We Europeans come to America, and we admire just as much the different system you have here, but you cannot force Europe to be governed in the way America is, because the circumstances are so different as to make any identity of system such as you suggest absolutely out of the question. It is a false analogy, on which you have based your question.

(The lady in the box speaks.)

I am telling you that the pro-Germans are wanting a peace movement. I know that Jacob Schiff, who admits he is a pro-German and wants Germany to be "moderately victorious," is engineering two peace movements. I think there are many people working for peace who fail to realise that peace on the wrong basis will not be peace. I ask the peace lovers here to be careful not to be exploited in the name of peace in the interests of the makers of the war. I will put them on their guard, for we have a right to tell you when we see danger to the cause about which we are not merely theorising, but making great sacrifice, and we have a right to tell you that when you cry for peace where there is no peace, that you are helping to perpetuate the reign of war. That I have said, and I say it again.

Question : Why is the English woman suffrage cause a failure?

Miss Pankhurst : It is not a failure, and the Suffragettes are there to see that it is not. Why, the Suffragettes are not far from being the freest women in the world. When you have paid for freedom you are free, and when they talk of England being worn out, we answer that England is being reborn. Do you suppose that a country is dead and done

for which has women who are prepared to fight as the militants have done, and men who are prepared to give up their careers and their homes and voluntarily go out and face death in the trenches? No; the British men and the British women—in the last few years the women, and in the last few months the men—have shown that Britain is more alive than she ever was.

Question: Does the seizure of American ships by Great Britain show a friendly spirit?

Miss Pankhurst: Now I have dealt with that matter. We are doing what Americans do and it is our duty to do, according to international law and the necessities of freedom at this time.

The Women's Social and Political Union.

Women who believe in liberty and progress should join the W.S.P.U. For full particulars apply to the Hon. Secretary, Lincoln's Inn House, Kingsway, London, W.C.

"The Suffragette,"

THE OFFICIAL ORGAN OF

THE WOMEN'S SOCIAL AND POLITICAL UNION.

Price 1d. Weekly.

Publication temporarily suspended owing to war conditions.
NOTICE WILL BE GIVEN WHEN PUBLICATION IS RESUMED.

THE GREAT SCOURGE And How to End It By CHRISTABEL PANKHURST, LL.B.

This book is of great interest, in that it treats of Venereal disease from the Woman's point of view. It has been recommended by members of the Medical Profession, and also by many of the Clergy. It was under discussion at the recent sittings of the Royal Commission on Venereal Diseases, and was highly recommended by Sir Victor Horsley in his evidence before that Commission.

To be obtained from any bookseller or from The Women's Social and Political Union, Lincoln's Inn House, Kingsway.

PRICE: 1/- nett. Cloth Bound, 2/6 nett.

ORDER AT ONCE FROM YOUR BOOKSELLER.

Books and Pamphlets to be obtained from the Woman's Press,

LINCOLN'S INN HOUSE, KINGSWAY, W.C.

My Own Story. By MRS. PANKHURST	7/6 Nett
Who is Responsible? Armageddon and After! By CLOUDESLEY BRERETON	7d.
Prison and Prisoners. By LADY CONSTANCE LYTTON ...	3/6
The Suffragette. By SYLVIA PANKHURST	6/-
The Life of Emily Wilding Davison. By G. COLMORE ...	6d. and 1/-
The Prisoner: An Experience of Forcible Feeding ...	1/-
Where Are You Going To? By ELIZABETH ROBINS ...	4/6
Way Stations. By ELIZABETH ROBINS	6/-
Women and Economics. By CHARLOTTE PERKINS GILMAN.	1/-

PAMPHLETS:

Why We Are Militant. By MRS. PANKHURST... ..	1d.
The Importance of the Vote. By MRS. PANKHURST ...	1d.
Militant Methods in History. By JOSEPH CLAYTON ...	1d.
Treatment of the Woman's Deputation by the Police ...	1d.
The War. By CHRISTABEL PANKHURST	1d.
America and The War. By CHRISTABEL PANKHURST ...	2d.
Cardinal Mercier's Pastoral Letter	

